



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/496,990	02/02/2000	Man Pak Yip	081862.P173	6948
75	90 10/23/2002			
Thinh V Nguyen			EXAMINER	
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard			QURESHI, SHABANA	
7th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	
			DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

K)

Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit 2155				he
Examiner Shabana Qureshi 2155		Application No.	licant(s)	
Shabana Qureshi 2155	•	09/496,990	YIP ET AL.	
- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address — Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ② MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Exercisions of term empt be available under the processors of 3 CFR 1.136(a), in no event, however, may a reply be timely flied If the period for reply specified shove is less than thinly (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thinly (30) days will be considered timely. If the period for reply specified shows he maximum statutory period will appear and we eight SN (MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Family being by within the sation referred for reply will, by datable, cause the application to become AttANCONED (50 U.S.C. § 1.13). Responsive to communication(s) filled on 02 February 2000. 20	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Statestors of three may be available under the provisions of 3° CFA 1.35(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed states of the may be available under the provisions of 3° CFA 1.35(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed states of the common of the provision of the provision of 3° CFA 1.35(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed. - States of the provision of the provision of 3° CFA 1.35(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed. - States of the provision of the provision of 3° CFA 1.35(a). In order, however, may a reply be timely filed. - States of the provision of Claims - Application of Claims - Application of Papers - Provision of Glaims of the provision of the priority documents have b				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Editables of the many by a resible under the provision of 3° CFR 1.35(a), in ne event, however, may a reply be timely filed Editables of the set of extended period of reply specified above is likes than thirty (30) days, a reply whiten the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered sheely. If the period for reply specified above is likes than thirty (30) days, a reply whiten the statutory minimum of the reply and will expire (30) MONTHS from the making date of this communication. Final the period for reply specified above is like than their (30) days, a reply whiten the statutory minimum of the replace of the communication of the communication. Final the period for reply specified above is like than their (30) days and the graph and will expire (30) MONTHS from the making date of this communication. Final the period of the set of extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the spinitation to become AshiktONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1.48 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 1.48 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1.48 is/are rejected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. 11) The proposed drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected from the foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) (d) or (f). a) All b) some c) None of: 11) Cer		appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence addr	ess
Status Responsive to communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any general patter than adjustment. Sea 37 CFR 1.704(s). Status Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2000. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the menits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) is/are objected to by the Examiner. 10) The psecification is objected to by the Examiner. 4pplication Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. Application Papers 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2000 is/are: a) coepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Application Papers 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17 2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and/o	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.	N. t 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the field will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC	a reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this comr	munication.
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <i>02 February 2000</i> . 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) <i>1_48</i> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on <i>02 February 2000</i> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved by disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Corpies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) He translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35	 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 			
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) are subject to to estriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s)		02 February 2000		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application), a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
A) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) □ The drawing(s) filed on our equest that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) □ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of: 1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2.□ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3.□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) □ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1 □ Notice of References Cited (PTO-992) 2) □ Notice of References Cited (PTO-992) 3 □ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	3) Since this application is in condition for allo	owance except for formal m		merits is
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 February 2000</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) □ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) □ approved b) □ disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and 120 13) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of: 1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) □ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 10 ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 20 ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ler <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some *c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1 Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are pending in the applicat	tion.		
6) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some *c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1 Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 2 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5 Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	drawn from consideration.		
7 Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8 Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9 The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10 The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 February 2000</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11 The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12 The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13 Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3 Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 10 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 21 Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
8	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are rejected.			
Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		d/or election requirement.		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 02 February 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)	<u> </u>			
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)	<u> </u>		•	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 10 Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 21 Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 22 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 10 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 41 Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 52 Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			disapproved by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, •		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5 Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		LAMITHIEI.		
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5 Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	<u> </u>	sian milarity yandar 25 H C C	C 440(=) (d) == (5)	
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	_	eigh phonty under 35 0.5.C	. 9 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	<u> </u>	anta haya baan raasiyad		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	<u> </u>		Annlination No	
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	<u> </u>			
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	application from the International	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		age
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	estic priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(e) (to a provisional ap	oplication).
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	<u> </u>	• • •		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	Attachment(s)		73	
	1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s	5) Notice of		

Art Unit: 2155

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Terms such as ECR, utility factor, transport device speed, queue depth are not defined to illustrate the functionality of the term.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah et al (U.S. 5,917,804).

As per claim 1, Shah et al teach an apparatus to control connection admission for a connection request in a network, the system comprising two estimators that estimate the required bandwidth using two different methods, and a controller that makes a decision on connection admission based on the lower bandwidth estimated. The estimators disclosed by Shah et al

Art Unit: 2155

employ models that determine the parameters of the applicant's invention, such as: an ECR based on the description of the connection request, the description including a booking factor (column 6, lines 46-63) and a measured utilization factor for admitted connections in the network using measurements of data streams arriving at queues (column 6, lines 34-45). Shah et al also teach a controller coupled to the first and second estimators to generate an admission decision for the connection request based on the parameters passed on by the first and second estimators. However, Shah teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are the two values of estimated virtual bandwidths, while the applicant teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are ECR and measured utilization factor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to pass the ECR and utilization factor to the controller instead of the virtual bandwidth, because either may be used to make an admission decision. The controller of the applicant's invention must compute the virtual bandwidth in order to make the admission decision. The determination of the virtual bandwidth at the estimation step does not make the applicant's invention a novel invention.

As per claim 2 Shah et al teach the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the description of connection request further includes a connection descriptor and quality of service descriptor (column 1, lines 37-47; column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 3, Shah et al teach the apparatus of claim 2, wherein the connection descriptor includes at least one of a cell rate, a transport device speed, a queue depth, a cell loss ratio, and a link capacity (column 1, lines 37-47, column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 4, Shah et al teaches the apparatus of claim 2, wherein the cell rate is one of a PCR, SCR, MBS, and a MCR (column 7, lines 33-41).

Art Unit: 2155

As per claim 5, Shah et al teach the apparatus of claim 4, wherein the QoS descriptor is one of a CBR, rt-VBR, nrt-VBR, UBR, ABR, and a GBR (column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 23).

As per claims 6-11, Shah et al teach the apparatus of claim 5. However, Shah et al does not teach that a scaled cell rate is determined by the use of data structures, arrays, link lists, etc. It is not explicitly stated that the arrays are indexed by certain values or contain certain ratios, but the arrays contain the same parameters as claimed by the applicant and yield the same result (columns 7-10). The calculations are also inherent to Shah et al, but with obvious variations. Other references that teach these calculations are Petajisto et al (WO 99/65194, pages 10-13), Beshai et al (US 5,881,049, columns 3-10).

As per claim 12, Kinnunen teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the estimators comprise:

- A capacity estimator to estimate a minimum resource needed for the admitted connections meeting QoS requirements within a measurement window (column 6, lines 37-45); and
- A measured utilization factor generator coupled to the capacity estimator to generate the measured utilization factor using the estimated minimum resource and measurement parameters (column 6, lines 37-45).

As per claim 13, Shah et al teach a method to control connection admission for a connection request in a network, the system comprising two estimators that estimate the required bandwidth using two different methods, and a controller that makes a decision on connection admission based on the lower bandwidth estimated. The estimators disclosed by Shah et al employ models that determine the parameters of the applicant's invention, such as: an ECR

Art Unit: 2155

based on the description of the connection request, the description including a booking factor (column 6, lines 46-63) and a measured utilization factor for admitted connections in the network using measurements of data streams arriving at queues (column 6, lines 34-45). Shah et al also teach a controller coupled to the first and second estimators to generate an admission decision for the connection request based on the parameters passed on by the first and second estimators. However, Shah teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are the two values of estimated virtual bandwidths, while the applicant teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are ECR and measured utilization factor. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to pass the ECR and utilization factor to the controller instead of the virtual bandwidth, because either may be used to make an admission decision. The controller of the applicant's invention must compute the virtual bandwidth in order to make the admission decision. The determination of the virtual bandwidth at the estimation step does not make the applicant's invention a novel invention.

As per claim 14, Shah et al teach the method of claim 13, wherein the description of connection request further includes a connection descriptor and quality of service descriptor (column 1, lines 37-47; column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 15, Shah et al teach the method of claim 14, wherein the connection descriptor includes at least one of a cell rate, a transport device speed, a queue depth, a cell loss ratio, and a link capacity (column 1, lines 37-47, column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 16, Shah et al teaches the method of claim 14, wherein the cell rate is one of a PCR, SCR, MBS, and a MCR (column 7, lines 33-41).

Art Unit: 2155

As per claim 17, Shah et al teach the method of claim 16, wherein the QoS descriptor is one of a CBR, rt-VBR, nrt-VBR, UBR, ABR, and a GBR (column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 23).

As per claims 18-23, Shah et al teach the method of claim 17. However, Shah et al does not teach that a scaled cell rate is determined by the use of data structures, arrays, link lists, etc. It is not explicitly stated that the arrays are indexed by certain values or contain certain ratios, but the arrays contain the same parameters as claimed by the applicant and yield the same result (columns 7-10). The calculations are also inherent to Shah et al, but with obvious variations. Other references that teach these calculations are Petajisto et al (WO 99/65194, pages 10-13), Beshai et al (US 5,881,049, columns 3-10).

As per claims 24, Kinnunen teaches the method of claim 13, wherein the estimators comprise:

- A capacity estimator to estimate a minimum resource needed for the admitted connections meeting QoS requirements within a measurement window (column 6, lines 37-45); and
- A measured utilization factor generator coupled to the capacity estimator to generate the measured utilization factor using the estimated minimum resource and measurement parameters (column 6, lines 37-45).

As per claim 25, Shah et al teach a computer program product to control connection admission for a connection request in a network, the computer program product comprising two estimators that estimate the required bandwidth using two different methods, and a controller that makes a decision on connection admission based on the lower bandwidth estimated. The estimators disclosed by Shah et al employ models that determine the parameters of the

Art Unit: 2155

applicant's invention, such as: an ECR based on the description of the connection request, the description including a booking factor (column 6, lines 46-63) and a measured utilization factor for admitted connections in the network using measurements of data streams arriving at queues (column 6, lines 34-45). Shah et al also teach a controller coupled to the first and second estimators to generate an admission decision for the connection request based on the parameters passed on by the first and second estimators. However, Shah teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are the two values of estimated virtual bandwidths, while the applicant teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are ECR and measured utilization factor. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to pass the ECR and utilization factor to the controller instead of the virtual bandwidth, because either may be used to make an admission decision. The controller of the applicant's invention must compute the virtual bandwidth in order to make the admission decision. The determination of the virtual bandwidth at the estimation step does not make the applicant's invention a novel invention.

As per claim 26, Shah et al teach the computer program product of claim 25, wherein the description of connection request further includes a connection descriptor and quality of service descriptor (column 1, lines 37-47; column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 27, Shah et al teach the computer program product of claim 26, wherein the connection descriptor includes at least one of a cell rate, a transport device speed, a queue depth, a cell loss ratio, and a link capacity (column 1, lines 37-47, column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 28, Shah et al teaches the computer program product of claim 26, wherein the cell rate is one of a PCR, SCR, MBS, and a MCR (column 7, lines 33-41).

Art Unit: 2155

As per claim 29, Shah et al teach the computer program product of claim 28, wherein the QoS descriptor is one of a CBR, rt-VBR, nrt-VBR, UBR, ABR, and a GBR (column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 23).

As per claims 30-35, Shah et al teach the computer program product of claim 29. However, Shah et al does not teach that a scaled cell rate is determined by the use of data structures, arrays, link lists, etc. It is not explicitly stated that the arrays are indexed by certain values or contain certain ratios, but the arrays contain the same parameters as claimed by the applicant and yield the same result (columns 7-10). The calculations are also inherent to Shah et al, but with obvious variations. Other references that teach these calculations are Petajisto et al (WO 99/65194, pages 10-13), Beshai et al (US 5,881,049, columns 3-10).

As per claims 36, Kinnunen teaches the computer program product of claim 25, wherein the estimators comprise:

- A capacity estimator to estimate a minimum resource needed for the admitted connections meeting QoS requirements within a measurement window (column 6, lines 37-45); and
- A measured utilization factor generator coupled to the capacity estimator to generate the measured utilization factor using the estimated minimum resource and measurement parameters (column 6, lines 37-45).

As per claim 37, Shah et al teach a system interfacing a network with connection admission for a connection request in a network, the system comprising two estimators that estimate the required bandwidth using two different methods, and a controller that makes a decision on connection admission based on the lower bandwidth estimated. The estimators disclosed by Shah et al employ models that determine the parameters of the applicant's

Art Unit: 2155

invention, such as: an ECR based on the description of the connection request, the description including a booking factor (column 6, lines 46-63) and a measured utilization factor for admitted connections in the network using measurements of data streams arriving at queues (column 6, lines 34-45). Shah et al also teach a controller coupled to the first and second estimators to generate an admission decision for the connection request based on the parameters passed on by the first and second estimators. However, Shah teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are the two values of estimated virtual bandwidths, while the applicant teaches that the parameters passed on to the controller are ECR and measured utilization factor. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to pass the ECR and utilization factor to the controller instead of the virtual bandwidth, because either may be used to make an admission decision. The controller of the applicant's invention must compute the virtual bandwidth in order to make the admission decision. The determination of the virtual bandwidth at the estimation step does not make the applicant's invention a novel invention.

As per claim 38, Shah et al teach the system of claim 37, wherein the description of connection request further includes a connection descriptor and quality of service descriptor (column 1, lines 37-47; column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 39, Shah et al teach the system of claim 38, wherein the connection descriptor includes at least one of a cell rate, a transport device speed, a queue depth, a cell loss ratio, and a link capacity (column 1, lines 37-47, column 8, lines 55-60).

As per claim 40, Shah et al teaches the system of claim 38, wherein the cell rate is one of a PCR, SCR, MBS, and a MCR (column 7, lines 33-41).

Art Unit: 2155

As per claim 41, Shah et al teach the system of claim 40, wherein the QoS descriptor is one of a CBR, rt-VBR, nrt-VBR, UBR, ABR, and a GBR (column 1, line 66 – column 2, line 23).

As per claims 42-47, Shah et al teach the system of claim 41. However, Shah et al does not teach that a scaled cell rate is determined by the use of data structures, arrays, link lists, etc. It is not explicitly stated that the arrays are indexed by certain values or contain certain ratios, but the arrays contain the same parameters as claimed by the applicant and yield the same result (columns 7-10). The calculations are also inherent to Shah et al, but with obvious variations. Other references that teach these calculations are Petajisto et al (WO 99/65194, pages 10-13), Beshai et al (US 5,881,049, columns 3-10).

As per claims 48, Kinnunen teaches the system of claim 37, wherein the estimators comprise:

- A capacity estimator to estimate a minimum resource needed for the admitted connections meeting QoS requirements within a measurement window (column 6, lines 37-45); and
- A measured utilization factor generator coupled to the capacity estimator to generate the measured utilization factor using the estimated minimum resource and measurement parameters (column 6, lines 37-45).

Art Unit: 2155

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shabana Qureshi whose telephone number is (703) 308-6118. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

SQ

October 18, 2002

\ `AYAZ SHEIKH SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100